

**NOTICE: THIS DECISION DOES NOT CREATE LEGAL PRECEDENT AND MAY NOT BE CITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY APPLICABLE RULES.**  
See Ariz. R. Supreme Court 111(c); ARCAP 28(c); Ariz. R. Crim. P. 31.24.

FILED BY CLERK

APR -2 2009

COURT OF APPEALS  
DIVISION TWO

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
STATE OF ARIZONA  
DIVISION TWO

In the Matter of the Estate of )

ANGELINE SHARKOZY, )

Deceased. )

\_\_\_\_\_  
WILLIAM SHARKOZY, )

Appellant, )

v. )

CAROL WALKER and FLORENCE )

THOMPSON, Co-Personal )

Representatives, )

Appellees. )

2 CA-CV 2008-0131

DEPARTMENT B

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Not for Publication

Rule 28, Rules of

Civil Appellate Procedure

APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF GILA COUNTY

Cause No. PB20070103

Honorable Robert Duber, II, Judge

AFFIRMED

---

William Sharkozy

Payson  
In Propria Persona

Thompson, Montgomery & DeRose  
By Jerry B. DeRose

Globe  
Attorneys for Appellees

---

B R A M M E R, Judge.

¶1 Appellant William Sharkozy appeals the trial court's appointment of appellees Carol Walker and Florence Thompson, his sisters, as personal representatives of their mother, Angeline Sharkozy's, estate. We affirm.

### **Factual and Procedural Background**

¶2 The relevant facts are undisputed. Angeline died in July 2007. In December 2007, Carol and Florence filed a petition requesting that the Gila County Superior Court find their mother died intestate and appoint them as co-personal representatives of her estate. William objected to his sisters' petition, alleging they were unfit to serve. After a hearing, the trial court granted Carol and Florence's petition. This appeal followed.

### **Discussion**

¶3 William argues the court improperly failed to consider eighteen exhibits, which, he asserts, demonstrated his sisters' unfitness to serve as personal representatives. He also contends the court abused its discretion in quashing a subpoena he had served on his brother. William, however, fails to support his arguments with any citations to the record or legal authority and does not otherwise develop them in any meaningful way. *See* Ariz. R. Civ. App.

P. 13(a)(6). He, therefore, has waived these arguments, and we do not address them further. *See Lohmeier v. Hammer*, 214 Ariz. 57, n.5, 148 P.3d 101, 108 n.5 (App. 2006); *In re \$26,980.00 U.S. Currency*, 199 Ariz. 291, ¶ 28, 18 P.3d 85, 93 (App. 2000) (declining to consider party’s “bald assertion[s] offered without elaboration or citation to any . . . legal authority”).

### **Disposition**

¶4 For the foregoing reason, we affirm the trial court’s order appointing Carol and Florence as co-personal representatives of their mother’s estate. We decline, however, Carol and Florence’s request for attorney fees on appeal pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-341.01(C), because they have failed to assert, let alone demonstrate, that William’s appellate claims constituted harassment and were made in bad faith.

---

J. WILLIAM BRAMMER, JR., Judge

CONCURRING:

---

PETER J. ECKERSTROM, Presiding Judge

---

GARYE L. VÁSQUEZ, Judge